

Remarks

Introduction

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-14, 18-32, 34, 36-42, 47-63, 65-90, 92-109 and 124-129 were pending in this application.

Applicants have canceled claims 1-5, 7, 9-14, 18-32, 34, 36-42, 47-56 and 124-127 without prejudice. Applicants have also amended independent claims 57 and 81 and added new claims 130-139 in order to more particularly define the claimed invention. No new matter has been added and the amendments and new claims are fully supported by the originally-filed application (*see e.g.*, FIG. 8, page 19, lines 12-19 and page 27, lines 29-32 of applicants' specification).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

Applicants' Reply

The Examiner rejected claims 57-63, 65-74, 76-90, 92-103, 105-109, 128 and 129 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Inoue et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,884,141 ("Inoue") in view of Armstrong et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,017,173 ("Armstrong"). The Examiner rejected claims 75 and 104 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Inoue in view of Armstrong and in further view of Banker et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,357,276 ("Banker").

Amended independent claims 57 and 81 are directed to a method and a system for substituting pause-time content in place of media that is paused using an interactive media application. A user is provided with the ability to pause the media, and pause-time content to play while the media is paused is determined. The determined pause-time content is played by substituting the determined pause-time content in place of the media while the media is paused. It is determined whether media data associated with the determined pause-time content indicates that the user should be prevented from accessing a feature of the interactive media application, and the user is prevented from accessing the feature.

Applicants respectfully submit that Inoue fails to show or suggest determining whether media data associated with pause-time content indicates that a user should be prevented from accessing a feature of an interactive media application, and preventing the user

from accessing the feature. Inoue refers to continuing to display a first program, displaying a second program or displaying a pause graphics screen when the first program is paused (*see* col. 6, lines 30-33). However, Inoue does not show or suggest determining whether data associated with the first program, the second program or the pause graphics screen indicates that a user should not be given access to a feature of an interactive media application and preventing the user from accessing the feature. Instead, Inoue merely discloses displaying a program or a graphics screen during a pause. Accordingly, Inoue fails to show or suggest "determining whether media data associated with the determined pause-time content indicates that the user should be prevented from accessing a feature of the interactive media application" and "preventing the user from accessing the feature," as recited by amended independent claims 57 and 81.

Additionally, applicants respectfully submit that Armstrong does not make up for the deficiencies of Inoue. Armstrong refers to associating specific scenes of a program with a predetermined group of targeted advertisements and associating a user with a demographic profile. When the program is paused, a subset of the predetermined group of targeted advertisements that corresponds to the currently displayed scene and that is consistent with the user's demographic profile is presented (col. 5, lines 33-61). However, Armstrong does not show or suggest determining whether data associated with the targeted advertisements indicates that a user should not be given access to a feature of an interactive media application, and preventing the user from accessing the feature. Although Armstrong refers to allowing a user to access more information about goods and/or services associated with a requested program (*see* col. 9, lines 57-61), Armstrong fails to show or suggest preventing a user from accessing a feature after determining, from media data, that the user should not be allowed to access the feature. Thus, Armstrong fails to show or suggest "determining whether media data associated with the determined pause-time content indicates that the user should be prevented from accessing a feature of the interactive media application" and "preventing the user from accessing the feature," as recited by amended independent claims 57 and 81. Accordingly, Inoue and Armstrong, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to show or suggest all the features of amended independent claims 57 and 81.

Furthermore, Banker, which the Examiner uses in the rejection of dependent claims 75 and 104, does not make up for the deficiencies of Inoue and Armstrong relative to the rejection.

For these reasons, applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 57 and 81 are allowable over the prior art of record. Claims 58-63, 65-80, 82-90, 92-109, 128 and 129 are also allowable at least because claims 58-63, 65-80, 82-90, 92-109, 128 and 129 depend directly or indirectly from allowable independent claims 57 and 81. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, that the § 103(a) rejections of claims 57-63, 65-90, 92-109, 128 and 129 be withdrawn.

New claims 130-139

New claims 130-139 depend directly or indirectly from allowable independent claims 57 and 81. Accordingly, new claims 130-139 are allowable over the prior art of record at least for the same reasons that independent claims 57 and 81 are, as detailed above.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Baaba Andam/

Baaba Andam
Limited Recognition No. L0455
Agent for Applicants
Ropes & Gray LLP
Customer No. 75563
1211 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8704
Tel. No.: (212) 596-9000